	Case 1:22-cv-00295-AWI-HBK Documer	nt 11 Filed 03/29/23 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ISAIAH B. RAMIREZ,	CASE NO. 1:22-cv-00295-AWI-HBK (HC)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
13	v.	RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, AND DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO ENTER JUDGMENT AND CLOSE CASE
14	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	
15	Respondent.	(Doc. Nos. 1, 8)
16		(, . , . ,
17		
18	Petitioner Isaiah B. Ramirez, while a pretrial detainee, initiated this action by filing a pro	
19	se petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Doc. No. 1. On November	
20	21, 2022, the magistrate judge assigned to the case issued findings and recommendations to	
21	dismiss the petition for failure to prosecute. Doc. No. 10. These findings and recommendations	
22	were served on all parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within	
23	fourteen days from the date of service of that order. As of the date of this order Petitioner has not	
24	filed objections, and the deadline for doing so has expired.	
25	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a	
26	de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that	
27	the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper	
28	analysis.	
ı	.I	-

Case 1:22-cv-00295-AWI-HBK Document 11 Filed 03/29/23 Page 2 of 3

1 In addition, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability. A state prisoner 2 seeking a writ of habeas corpus has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of 3 his petition, and an appeal is only allowed in certain circumstances. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 4 U.S. 322, 335–36 (2003). The controlling statute in determining whether to issue a certificate of 5 appealability is 28 U.S.C. § 2253, which provides as follows: 6 (a) In a habeas corpus proceeding or a proceeding under section 2255 before a 7 district judge, the final order shall be subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the circuit in which the proceeding is held. 8 (b) There shall be no right of appeal from a final order in a proceeding to test the 9 validity of a warrant to remove to another district or place for commitment or trial a person charged with a criminal offense against the United States, or to test the 10 validity of such person's detention pending removal proceedings. 11 (c) 12 (1) Unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability, an appeal may not be taken to the court of appeals from— 13 (A) the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding in which the 14 detention complained of arises out of process issued by a State court; or 15 (B) the final order in a proceeding under section 2255. 16 (2) A certificate of appealability may issue under paragraph (1) only if the 17 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 18 (3) The certificate of appealability under paragraph (1) shall indicate which 19 specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2). 20 If a court denies a petitioner's petition, the court may only issue a certificate of 21 appealability when a petitioner makes a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 22 § 2253(c)(2). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner must establish that "reasonable 23 jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved 24 25 26 U.S. 880, 893 & n.4 (1983)). 27 28

in a different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) (quoting Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 In the present case, the Court finds that Petitioner has not made the required substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right to justify the issuance of a certificate of 2

Case 1:22-cv-00295-AWI-HBK Document 11 Filed 03/29/23 Page 3 of 3 appealability. Reasonable jurists would not find the Court's determination that Petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas corpus relief debatable, wrong, or deserving of encouragement to proceed further. Thus, the Court will decline to issue a certificate of appealability. **ORDER** Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 10) issued on November 21, 2022, are ADOPTED in full; 2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. No. 1) is DISMISSED; 3. The Clerk of Court shall ENTER judgment and CLOSE the file; and 4. The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>March 28, 2023</u> SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE